# COUNTY EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES IN OKLAHOMA SECOND QUARTER 2008 

## Two Largest Counties Experienced Above-Average Employment and Wage Growth

Employment in Tulsa County rose 1.1 percent from June 2007 to June 2008 and in Oklahoma County, 0.7 percent, both counter to the national employment decline of 0.3 percent during this period, according to data released by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Regional Commissioner Stanley W. Suchman noted that over-the-year wage growth in both of the State's large counties also outpaced the nationwide average. Oklahoma County's average wage increased 6.0 percent to $\$ 777$ and Tulsa County's rose 3.2 percent to $\$ 766$. Nationally, wages were up 2.6 percent from June 2007. Oklahoma and Tulsa were the only two large counties in the State, that is, they had 75,000 or more jobs as measured by 2007 annual average employment. (See table A.)

Table A. Covered [1] employment and wages in the United States and the $\mathbf{2}$ largest counties in Oklahoma, second quarter 2008 [2]

| Area | Employment |  |  | Average Weekly Wage [3] |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | June <br> 2008 <br> (thousands) | Percent <br> change, June <br> $2007-08[4]$ | National <br> ranking by <br> percent <br> change [5] | Average <br> weekly <br> wage | National <br> ranking by <br> level [5] | Percent <br> change, <br> second quarter <br> $2007-08[4]$ | National <br> ranking by <br> percent <br> change [5] |
| United States [6] | $136,631.8$ | -0.3 | -- | $\$ 841$ | -- | 2.6 | -- |
| Oklahoma | $1,556.0$ | 1.0 | 9 | 701 | 40 | 5.3 | 5 |
| Oklahoma, Okla. | 425.0 | 0.7 | 71 | 777 | 168 | 6.0 | 9 |
| Tulsa, Okla. | 351.2 | 1.1 | 48 | 766 | 183 | 3.2 | 109 |

[^0]Employment and wage levels (but not over-the-year changes) are also available for the 75 counties in Oklahoma with employment below 75,000. Among these smaller counties, the highest average weekly wage was $\$ 793$ in Washington and the lowest was $\$ 447$ in Cimarron. When all 77 counties in the State were considered, 7 had average weekly wages of $\$ 700$ or more, 25 had wages from $\$ 600$ to $\$ 699$, 38 averaged $\$ 500$ to $\$ 599$, and 7 were below $\$ 500$. (See table 1.)

## Large County Employment

Tulsa and Oklahoma Counties were among 125 large counties nationwide with over-theyear employment growth. Tulsa's 1.1-percent job growth ranked $48^{\text {th }}$ among all 334 large counties, and Oklahoma's 0.7-percent increase ranked $71^{\text {st }}$, placing both in the nation's top onefourth. Combined, the two counties accounted for one-half of the State's employment gain. (See table A.)

Nationally, Orleans County, La., had the largest over-the-year percentage increase in employment ( 5.6 percent). Williamson, Texas, had the next largest increase, 4.3 percent, followed by the counties of Fort Bend, Texas (4.2 percent), Tulare, Calif. ( 4.0 percent), and Montgomery, Texas ( 3.8 percent). Employment declined in 188 counties during this period, with the largest percentage decline occurring in Lee, Fla. (-8.8 percent). Collier, Fla., had the next largest percentage decline ( -6.8 percent), followed by the counties of Sarasota, Fla., and Elkhart, Ind. (-6.5 percent each), and Marion, Fla. (-6.0 percent).

## Large County Average Weekly Wages

Of the 334 largest counties in the United States, 224 had average weekly wages below the national average of $\$ 841$. Oklahoma County's $\$ 777$ average weekly wage ranked $168^{\text {th }}$ and Tulsa County's $\$ 766$ placed $183^{\text {rd }}$.

New York County, N.Y., led the nation with an average weekly wage of $\$ 1,569$. Santa Clara, Calif., was second at \$1,529, followed by Washington, D.C. (\$1,433), Arlington, Va. ( $\$ 1,376$ ), and San Francisco, Calif. $(\$ 1,334)$.

At the other end of the spectrum, wages averaged less than $\$ 600$ per week in six large counties in the United States. The lowest average weekly wage was reported in Cameron, Texas (\$535), followed by Hidalgo, Texas (\$538), Horry, S.C. (\$539), Webb, Texas (\$562), Yakima, Wash. (\$580), and Tulare, Calif. (\$591). Wages in these lowest-ranked counties were less than 40 percent of the average weekly wage reported for the highest-ranked county, New York.

## Over-the-year Wage Changes

Although Oklahoma's two large counties had average weekly wages that were below the national average, their over-the-year wage growth exceeded that of the nation ( 2.6 percent). In fact, Oklahoma's 6.0 -percent wage gain ranked $9^{\text {th }}$ nationally while Tulsa's 3.2 -percent increase ranked $109^{\text {th }}$.

Rock Island, Ill., led the nation in growth in average weekly wages, with an increase of 10.5 percent from the second quarter of 2007. Weld, Colo., was second with growth of 10.4 percent, followed by the counties of Utah, Utah (9.4 percent), Whatcom, Wash. (8.3 percent), and East Baton Rouge, La. (7.8 percent).

Twenty-six large counties experienced over-the-year declines in average weekly wages. Clayton, Ga., had the largest decrease ( -43.7 percent), followed by the counties of Boone, Ky. (10.0 percent), Ventura, Calif., and Trumbull, Ohio ( -4.8 percent each), and Queens, N.Y. (-4.3 percent).

## State Average Weekly Wages

On a statewide level, Oklahoma's average weekly wage of $\$ 701$ ranked $40^{\text {th }}$ among the 50 states and the District of Columbia in the second quarter of 2008. Oklahoma's weekly wage was above that of neighboring Arkansas ( $\$ 661,46^{\text {th }}$ ), but below that of Kansas ( $\$ 720,33^{\text {rd }}$ ), Texas, $\left(\$ 849,14^{\text {th }}\right.$ ) and Colorado ( $\$ 858,13^{\text {th }}$ ). The District of Columbia had the highest weekly wage at $\$ 1,433$ and South Dakota had the lowest at $\$ 606$. (See table 2.)

Average weekly wages in the State of Oklahoma rose 5.3 percent from the second quarter of 2007 to the second quarter of 2008, ranking Oklahoma $5^{\text {th }}$ among the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia ranked $1^{\text {st }}$ with a 5.9 -percent wage gain, followed by North Dakota ( 5.8 percent) and Louisiana ( 5.5 percent). An over-the-year decline in average weekly wages was recorded in two states: Delaware ( -0.8 percent) and Georgia ( -0.6 percent).

Average weekly wage data by county are compiled under the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) program, also known as the ES-202 program. The data are derived from summaries of employment and total pay of workers covered by state and federal unemployment insurance (UI) legislation and provided by State Workforce Agencies (SWAs). The 9.1 million employer reports cover 136.6 million full- and part-time jobs. The average weekly wage values are calculated by dividing total quarterly wages by the average of the three monthly employment levels of those covered by UI programs. The result is then divided by 13, the number of weeks in a quarter. It is to be noted, therefore, that over-the-year wage changes for geographic areas may reflect shifts in the composition of employment by industry, occupation, and such other factors as hours of work. Thus, wages may vary among counties, metropolitan areas, or States for reasons other than changes in the average wage level. Data for all states, Metropolitan Statistical Areas, counties, and the nation are available on the BLS Web site at www.bls.gov/cew/; however, data in QCEW press releases have been adjusted (see Technical Note below) and may not match the data contained on the Bureau's Web site.

## Additional statistics and other information

An annual bulletin, Employment and Wages, features comprehensive information by detailed industry on establishments, employment, and wages for the nation and all states. The 2007 edition of this bulletin contains selected data produced by Business Employment Dynamics (BED) on job gains and losses, as well as selected data from the first quarter 2008 version of the national news release. Tables and additional content from the 2007 Employment and Wages Annual Bulletin are now available online at www.bls.gov/cew/cewbultn07.htm. These tables present final 2007 annual averages. The tables will also be included on the CD which accompanies the hardcopy version of the Annual Bulletin. Employment and Wages Annual Averages, 2007 will be available for sale as a chartbook by the end of the first quarter 2009 from the United States Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250, telephone 866-512-1800, outside Washington, D.C. Within Washington, D.C., the telephone number is 202-512-1800. The fax number is 202-512-2104.

QCEW-based news releases issued by other regional offices have been placed at one convenient BLS Web site location, www.bls.gov/cew/cewregional.htm. Information in this release will be made available to sensory impaired individuals upon request. Voice phone: 202-691-5200; TDD message referral phone number: 1-800-877-8339. For personal assistance or further information on the Quarterly Covered Employment and Wages Program, as well as other Bureau programs, contact the Dallas Information Office at 214-767-6970 from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. CT. This release is available in text and PDF format on the Dallas BLS Web site at www.bls.gov/ro6/home.htm.

## TECHNICAL NOTE

QCEW data are not designed as a time series. QCEW data are simply the sums of individual establishment records reflecting the number of establishments that exist in a county or industry at a point in time. Establishments can move in or out of a county or industry for a number of reasons--some reflecting economic events, others reflecting administrative changes.

The preliminary QCEW data presented in this release may differ from data released by the individual states as well as from the data presented on the BLS Web site. These potential differences result from the states' continuing receipt, review, and editing of UI data over time. On the other hand, differences between data in this release and the data found on the BLS Web site are the result of adjustments made to improve over-the-year comparisons. Specifically, these adjustments account for administrative (noneconomic) changes such as a correction to a previously reported location or industry classification. Adjusting for these administrative changes allows users to more accurately assess changes of an economic nature (such as a firm moving from one county to another or changing its primary economic activity) over a 12-month period. Currently, adjusted data are available only from BLS press releases.

Table 1. Covered [1] employment and wages in the United States and all of the counties in Oklahoma, second quarter 2008 [2]

| Area | Employment June 2008 | Average weekly wage [3] second quarter 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States [4] | 136,631,800 | \$841 |
| Oklahoma | 1,556,039 | \$701 |
| Adair County | 5,419 | \$535 |
| Alfalfa County | 1,360 | \$512 |
| Atoka County | 3,362 | \$523 |
| Beaver County | 1,455 | \$623 |
| Beckham County | 10,057 | \$742 |
| Blaine County | 3,381 | \$571 |
| Bryan County | 15,911 | \$577 |
| Caddo County | 7,121 | \$630 |
| Canadian County | 26,847 | \$662 |
| Carter County | 23,317 | \$669 |
| Cherokee County | 15,074 | \$545 |
| Choctaw County | 4,496 | \$515 |
| Cimarron County | 641 | \$447 |
| Cleveland County | 72,863 | \$626 |
| Coal County | 1,073 | \$515 |
| Comanche County | 42,431 | \$587 |
| Cotton County | 1,903 | \$565 |
| Craig County | 6,396 | \$549 |
| Creek County | 17,777 | \$668 |
| Custer County | 11,796 | \$592 |
| Delaware County | 8,848 | \$518 |
| Dewey County | 1,245 | \$589 |
| Ellis County | 1,075 | \$648 |
| Garfield County | 25,617 | \$649 |
| Garvin County | 9,693 | \$664 |
| Grady County | 12,995 | \$597 |
| Grant County | 1,138 | \$620 |
| Greer County | 1,380 | \$571 |
| Harmon County | 711 | \$497 |
| Harper County | 1,241 | \$566 |
| Haskell County | 3,857 | \$479 |
| Hughes County | 2,536 | \$547 |
| Jackson County | 10,644 | \$608 |
| Jefferson County | 1,154 | \$510 |
| Johnston County | 2,970 | \$553 |
| Kay County | 22,025 | \$654 |
| Kingfisher County | 6,335 | \$663 |
| Kiowa County | 2,379 | \$520 |
| Latimer County | 4,559 | \$768 |

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 1. Covered [1] employment and wages in the United States and all of the counties in Oklahoma, second quarter 2008 [2] (continued)

| Area | Employment June 2008 | Average weekly wage [3] second quarter 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Le Flore County | 13,688 | \$543 |
| Lincoln County | 7,733 | \$584 |
| Logan County | 7,019 | \$549 |
| Love County | 3,694 | \$485 |
| Major County | 2,437 | \$611 |
| Marshall County | 4,444 | \$570 |
| Mayes County | 11,869 | \$607 |
| McClain County | 7,624 | \$561 |
| McCurtain County | 10,056 | \$575 |
| McIntosh County | 4,352 | \$474 |
| Murray County | 5,477 | \$546 |
| Muskogee County | 29,766 | \$618 |
| Noble County | 4,269 | \$676 |
| Nowata County | 1,812 | \$526 |
| Okfuskee County | 2,279 | \$549 |
| Oklahoma County | 425,000 | \$777 |
| Okmulgee County | 10,564 | \$538 |
| Osage County | 6,434 | \$572 |
| Ottawa County | 12,069 | \$544 |
| Pawnee County | 3,662 | \$612 |
| Payne County | 32,442 | \$638 |
| Pittsburg County | 18,605 | \$678 |
| Pontotoc County | 17,500 | \$580 |
| Pottawatomie County | 21,620 | \$557 |
| Pushmataha County | 2,865 | \$510 |
| Roger Mills County | 792 | \$665 |
| Rogers County | 25,792 | \$703 |
| Seminole County | 8,014 | \$595 |
| Sequoyah County | 9,542 | \$491 |
| Stephens County | 16,240 | \$690 |
| Texas County | 8,872 | \$611 |
| Tillman County | 2,076 | \$547 |
| Tulsa County | 351,198 | \$766 |
| Wagoner County | 7,738 | \$621 |
| Washington County | 20,993 | \$793 |
| Washita County | 2,236 | \$646 |
| Woods County | 2,988 | \$498 |
| Woodward County | 10,398 | \$741 |

[1] Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
[2] Data are preliminary.
[3] Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
[4] Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

Table 2. Covered [1] employment and wages by state, second quarter 2008 [2]

| State | Employment |  | Average weekly wage [3] |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { June } \\ 2008 \\ \text { (thousands) } \end{gathered}$ | Percent change, June 2007-08 | Average weekly wage | National ranking by level | Percent change, second quarter 2007-08 | National ranking by percent change |
| United States [4] | 136,631.8 | -0.3 | \$841 | - | 2.6 | - |
| Alabama | 1,955.4 | -0.5 | 720 | 33 | 3.3 | 15 |
| Alaska | 330.6 | 1.4 | 860 | 12 | 3.1 | 16 |
| Arizona | 2,543.9 | -2.6 | 806 | 19 | 2.4 | 34 |
| Arkansas | 1,183.5 | -0.2 | 661 | 46 | 3.4 | 11 |
| California | 15,760.3 | -0.5 | 955 | 6 | 2.2 | 42 |
| Colorado | 2,346.3 | 0.8 | 858 | 13 | 3.1 | 16 |
| Connecticut | 1,722.3 | 0.5 | 1,036 | 4 | 0.3 | 49 |
| Delaware | 427.3 | -0.9 | 862 | 10 | -0.8 | 51 |
| District of Columbia | 691.4 | 1.2 | 1,433 | 1 | 5.9 | 1 |
| Florida | 7,620.1 | -3.4 | 762 | 26 | 2.6 | 30 |
| Georgia | 4,059.7 | -0.6 | 787 | 22 | -0.6 | 50 |
| Hawaii | 623.9 | -1.3 | 764 | 24 | 3.9 | 9 |
| Idaho | 671.9 | -0.9 | 636 | 48 | 1.6 | 46 |
| Illinois | 5,930.0 | -0.4 | 893 | 8 | 2.3 | 39 |
| Indiana | 2,906.5 | -0.9 | 715 | 38 | 1.9 | 43 |
| lowa | 1,521.2 | 0.1 | 683 | 42 | 2.9 | 23 |
| Kansas | 1,389.1 | 1.2 | 720 | 33 | 2.4 | 34 |
| Kentucky | 1,818.9 | -0.5 | 718 | 35 | 2.6 | 30 |
| Louisiana | 1,900.3 | 1.2 | 750 | 29 | 5.5 | 3 |
| Maine | 620.3 | 0.1 | 676 | 44 | 2.7 | 28 |
| Maryland | 2,577.7 | -0.3 | 920 | 7 | 2.8 | 26 |
| Massachusetts | 3,310.4 | 0.1 | 1,044 | 2 | 3.6 | 10 |
| Michigan | 4,163.3 | -2.2 | 825 | 18 | 2.4 | 34 |
| Minnesota | 2,733.9 | -0.5 | 849 | 14 | 1.8 | 45 |
| Mississippi | 1,139.1 | 0.1 | 635 | 49 | 4.4 | 7 |
| Missouri | 2,761.6 | 0.0 | 752 | 28 | 3.4 | 11 |
| Montana | 450.3 | 0.1 | 629 | 50 | 2.9 | 23 |
| Nebraska | 936.1 | 0.5 | 676 | 44 | 3.4 | 11 |
| Nevada | 1,271.8 | -1.9 | 797 | 20 | 2.7 | 28 |
| New Hampshire | 641.9 | -0.4 | 835 | 16 | 1.5 | 48 |
| New Jersey | 4,054.4 | -0.4 | 1,004 | 5 | 1.6 | 46 |
| New Mexico | 837.2 | 0.6 | 715 | 38 | 4.2 | 8 |
| New York | 8,758.2 | 0.6 | 1,040 | 3 | 2.3 | 39 |
| North Carolina | 4,083.6 | -0.1 | 735 | 31 | 2.4 | 34 |
| North Dakota | 356.4 | 2.5 | 654 | 47 | 5.8 | 2 |
| Ohio | 5,315.0 | -1.3 | 757 | 27 | 2.3 | 39 |
| Oklahoma | 1,556.0 | 1.0 | 701 | 40 | 5.3 | 5 |
| Oregon | 1,747.4 | -0.8 | 764 | 24 | 3.0 | 20 |
| Pennsylvania | 5,743.3 | 0.1 | 827 | 17 | 3.1 | 16 |
| Rhode Island | 481.6 | -2.2 | 796 | 21 | 2.8 | 26 |
| South Carolina | 1,907.5 | -0.6 | 681 | 43 | 2.4 | 34 |
| South Dakota | 409.0 | 1.2 | 606 | 51 | 2.9 | 23 |
| Tennessee | 2,752.7 | -0.4 | 745 | 30 | 1.9 | 43 |
| Texas | 10,510.3 | 2.2 | 849 | 14 | 2.5 | 33 |
| Utah | 1,234.3 | 0.1 | 716 | 37 | 2.6 | 30 |
| Vermont | 305.6 | -0.9 | 718 | 35 | 3.0 | 20 |
| Virginia | 3,720.4 | -0.3 | 885 | 9 | 3.0 | 20 |
| Washington | 3,000.9 | 0.3 | 862 | 10 | 3.4 | 11 |
| West Virginia | 715.3 | 0.0 | 695 | 41 | 5.1 | 6 |
| Wisconsin | 2,836.8 | -0.5 | 730 | 32 | 3.1 | 16 |
| Wyoming | 296.7 | 2.7 | 780 | 23 | 5.4 | 4 |
| Puerto Rico | 997.8 | -2.0 | 475 | [5] | 3.5 | [5] |
| Virgin Islands | 45.9 | -2.2 | 703 | [5] | -0.6 | [5] |

[^1] Federal Employees (UCFE) programs.
[2] Data are preliminary.
[3] Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
[4] Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.
[5] Data not included in the national ranking.


[^0]:    [1] Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for Federal (UCFE) programs.
    [2] Data are preliminary.
    [3] Average weekly wages were calculated using unrounded data.
    [4] Percent changes were computed from quarterly employment and pay data adjusted for noneconomic county reclassifications.
    [5] Ranking does not include the county of San Juan, Puerto Rico.
    [6] Totals for the United States do not include data for Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

[^1]:    [1] Includes workers covered by Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Unemployment Compensation for

